REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 26, 2006, was received and its contents carefully reviewed. Claims 1-40 were pending in the original application.

In the above amendments, Applicant amended paragraphs [0038, 0044, 0045, 0049, and 0059] in the Specification to correct minor informalities and typographical errors. Applicant also canceled claims 25-32. Further, Applicant amended independent claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 33, and 37 to highlight additional features of the present invention and to add additional context to the claims. Applicant also amended dependent claim 22 to correct a typographical error and amended dependent claim 36 to provide additional details. The features incorporated in the above amendments are disclosed in the original Specification at least on pages 7-9, 11-14, 16, and 17 and throughout the Specification and Figures.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter was introduced by these amendments. As now recited, claims 1-24 and claims 33-40 remain pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

A.   Drawings

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed on February 12, 2002.

B.   Information Disclosure Statements

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the Examiner's consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on August 15, 2002, and on March 2, 2006.

C.   Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 22 for an informality related to a typographical error. Originally claim 22 recited, "… a database coupled to said user input station that provides standard content identification tags segment division and markers for

insertion into said video stream." Applicant amended claim 22 above to correct the typographical error. Claim 22 now recites, "... a database coupled to said user input station that provides standard content identification tags and segment division markers for insertion into said video stream."

The Examiner also objected to claim 28 for an informality related to a typographical error where a space was inadvertently omitted between "claim" and "25". Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review. As indicated above, Applicant canceled claim 28.

Based upon the above amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections.

C.   Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. The Rejection of Claims 1-16 as Anticipated by the Elenbaas Application

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Elenbaas et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0028194 ("the Elenbaas application"). In view of the amendments above and the comments below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

The present invention pertains generally to video systems and control of displayed video information. More particularly, the systems and methods of the present invention insert video indicators, such as tags and markers, in a video signal to establish content information regarding video segments.

Applicant amended method claims 1, 8, and 12 to positively recite the steps of applying the time code signal to an address generator that decodes the time code signal and generates the corresponding video signal address, applying the corresponding video signal address to a database, applying user profile and preference data to a recognition device; comparing the user profile and preference data with the video stream encoded with the indicators, and displaying the encoded video stream at a display device. Additionally, Applicant amended system claims 5 and 16 to recite the system components used to perform the method of claims 1, 8, and 12, respectively. With respect, Applicant submits that the Elenbaas application fails to

disclose these steps as well as the system components required to carry out these steps.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites a method of generating and inserting an indicator into a video stream including generating a time code signal that is synchronized with the video stream and provides a numerical indication of the location of the video stream that corresponds to a video signal address of said video stream; applying the time code signal to an address generator that decodes the time code signal and generates the corresponding video signal address; and applying the corresponding video signal address to a database. Amended independent method claim 1 also recites the steps of generating the indicators at an end-user site and storing the indicators in the database; accessing the indicators that are stored in said database in response to the time code signal at the video signal address, and encoding the video stream with the indicators.

Claim 1 further recites applying user profile and preference data to a recognition device; comparing the user profile and preference data with the video stream encoded with the indicators; and displaying said encoded video stream at a display device.

In contrast, the Elenbaas application appears to discuss a news retrieval system that allows users to select and receive news stories of interest by receiving samples of news broadcasts from which a user may select a story (see the Elenbaas application, paragraphs [0009 and 0010]. The Elenbaas application includes a system that characterizes news stories and delivers samples of selected news stories that match each user's preference (see paragraph [0010]). Key frames of each selected news story are displayed, and a user can select the news story that is associated with a key frame (see paragraph [0010]). The Elenbaas application likens the disclosed personalized news retrieval system to channel surfing, where a user randomly samples a variety of channels for any of a number of topics that may be of interest (see paragraphs [0002 and 0008]).

There is no disclosure in the Elenbaas application of generating a time code signal that is synchronized with the video stream and provides a numerical indication

of the location of the video stream that corresponds to a video signal address of the video stream, nor of applying a time code signal to an address generator that decodes the time code signal and generates a corresponding video signal address as recited, for example, in amended independent claim 1. Instead, the cited sections of the Elenbaas application merely disclose a key frame at the beginning of each story segment. The first frame of each story segment corresponds to the key image frame that forms a pictorial summary of the story segment (see paragraph [0024]). There is no disclosure of generating a time code signal or of applying the time code signal to an address generator that decodes the time code signal and generates the corresponding video signal address as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Since there are no time code signals or video signal addresses disclosed in the Elenbaas application, there is likewise no accessing indicators that are stored in a database in response to the time code signal at the video signal address. Instead, the Elenbaas application appears to discuss how to detect changes in the video scene in order to determine the reference frames, that is, the first frame of the story segment (see paragraph [0025]). Also, the Elenbaas application discusses the manner in which each story segment is classified, and the classification options available (see paragraph [0026]), but there is no disclosure of generating a time code signal that is synchronized with the video stream and provides a numerical indication of the location of the video stream that corresponds to a video signal address of the video stream, nor of applying a time code signal to an address generator that decodes the time code signal and generates a corresponding video signal address as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The cited portions of the Elenbaas application fail to disclose these above-listed features recited in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose each and every feature of amended independent claim 1. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Dependent claims 2-4 depend upon amended independent claim 1. These dependent claims thereby include all the limitations of amended independent claim 1, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicant amended independent claim 1 to include limitations not disclosed by the Elenbaas application. Accordingly, with the dependency of claims 2-4 upon amended independent claim 1, the Elenbaas application also fails to disclose all of the features recited in dependent claims 2-4. Applicant respectfully submits that the Elenbaas application thereby fails to anticipate claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and that these claims are likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claims 2-4 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Applicant amended independent claims 5, 8, 12, and 16 to include features substantially similar to those recited above with regard to amended independent claim 1. Amended independent claim 5 recites system for encoding a video stream with indicators to perform the method of amended independent claim 1. Applicant amended claim 5 to include the components and limitations discussed above with regard to generating a time code signal, receiving and decoding the time code signal to generate a video signal address, and generating an indicator signal in response to the corresponding video signal address. Additionally, Applicant amended claim 5 to recite a recognition device that receives user profile and preference data and said video stream encoded with said indicators and compares the user profile and preference data with the video stream encoded with said indicators

As such, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 5 is allowable over the cited reference and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Dependent claims 6 and 7 depend upon amended independent claim 5. These dependent claims thereby include all the limitations of amended independent claim 5, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicant amended independent claim 5 to include limitations not disclosed by the Elenbaas application. Accordingly, with the dependency of claims 6 and 7 upon amended

independent claim 5, the Elenbaas application also fails to disclose all of the features recited in dependent claims 6 and 7. Applicant respectfully submits that the Elenbaas application thereby fails to anticipate claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and that these claims are likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claims 6 and 7 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

As indicated above with regard to independent claims 1 and 5, Applicant amended independent claims 8, 12, and 16 to also include features substantially similar to those recited above with regard to amended independent claims 1 and 5. Amended independent claim 8 recites a method of generating and inserting an indicator into a time encoded video stream similar to amended independent claim 1. Applicant amended claim 8 to include the steps and limitations discussed above with regard to applying an extracted time code to an address generator, generating an address signal in response to the extracted time code, and applying the address signal to a database to access indicators that are stored in the database in response to the address signal. Additionally, Applicant amended claim 8 to recite applying user profile and preference data to a recognition device that compares the user profile and preference data with the video stream encoded with the indicators and displays the video stream encoded with the indicators at a display device.

Applicant amended claim 12 to add additional steps not disclosed by the cited reference, including applying the time encoded video stream to a time code reader, sending the extracted time code to a comparator, generating indicators at an end-user site and storing the indicators at a selected address location in a database, and applying the time code signal to the database to access the indicators stored in the database at the selected address location in response to the time code signal.

Similarly, Applicant amended claim 16 to recite a system with components not disclosed by the cited reference. For example, claim 16 also includes a time code reader that reads a time code from the time encoded video stream that corresponds to a video signal address of the time encoded video stream, a comparator that receives the time code from the time code reader, and an encoder that receives the indicator signal

from the database and the time encoded video stream from the time code reader. With respect, Applicant submits that these features are not disclosed by the cited reference.

As outlined above, Applicant submits that amended independent claims 8, 12, and 16 are allowable over the cited reference and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 8, 12, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Dependent claims 9-11 and 13-15 depend upon amended independent claims 8 and 12, respectively. These dependent claims thereby include all the limitations of amended independent claims 8 and 12, respectively, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicant amended independent claims 8 and 12 to include limitations not disclosed by the Elenbaas application. Accordingly, with the dependency of claims 9-11 and 13-15 upon amended independent claims 8 and 12, respectively, the Elenbaas application also fails to disclose all of the features recited in dependent claims 9-11 and 13-15. Applicant respectfully submits that the Elenbaas application thereby fails to anticipate claims 9-11 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and that these claims are likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claims 9-11 and 13-15 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

2. The Rejection of Claims 17-22 as Anticipated by the Flavin Patent

Claims 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Flavin U.S. Patent Number 6,005,603 ("the Flavin patent"). In view of the amendments above and the comments below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

As outlined above, the present invention pertains generally to video systems and control of displayed video information. More particularly, the systems and methods of the present invention insert video indicators, such as tags and markers, in a video signal to establish content information regarding video segments.

Applicant amended independent method claim 17 and independent system claim 21 to positively recite the steps of applying the delayed video stream to an encoder, accessing tags and markers from a database, and generating indicators using

the tags and markers from the database to describe the content of the video stream. The generated indicators are then inserted at locations in the delayed video stream based upon information viewed in the video stream. Similarly, Applicant amended independent system claim 21 to recite the system components used to perform the method of claim 17. With respect, Applicant submits that the Flavin patent fails to disclose these steps as well as the system components required to carry out these steps.

For example, amended independent claim 17 recites a method of manually inserting indicators in a video stream. The method of claim 17 includes displaying the video stream to an operator, delaying the video stream to generate a delayed video stream, and displaying the delayed video stream to the operator. Claim 17 also includes applying the delayed video stream to an encoder, accessing tags and markers from a database, and generating indicators using the tags and markers from the database to describe the content of the video stream. Claim 17 then recites inserting the generated indicators at desired locations in the delayed video stream based upon information viewed in the video stream.

The Flavin patent, on the other hand, discusses a system and method for generating an output function based on the content of a stream of information. The Flavin patent appears to control information that is outputted from a television based upon headers and network messages. Headers and network messages indicative of commercials mute the sound recording of the television output, or pause a video recorder used to record the television output. See the Flavin patent, col. 1, line 54 to col. 2, line 16.

While the Flavin patent describes a group viewing a program being broadcast in real time or to be broadcast using tape at a later time, the Flavin patent produces the video stream to be broadcast prior to transmission of the broadcast. That is, there is no disclosure of delaying the video stream after it is presented to an operator, who affects inserting the indicators. In the Flavin patent, the video program is manipulated prior to broadcast, whether that broadcast occurs immediately after the manipulation or using tape at a later time (see col. 2, line 58 to col. 3, line 7). In the present

application, the video stream is transmitted and displayed to an operator who then delays this video stream to create a delayed video stream yet to be transmitted. The operator then views the original video stream, accesses tags and markers from a database, and creates indicators using the tags and markers from the database. The delayed video is applied to an encoder where the generated indicators are added to the delayed video stream, and the delayed video stream is output.

There is no disclosure in the Flavin patent of displaying a delayed video stream to an operator nor of applying the delayed video stream to an encoder and applying the generated indicators to the encoder and inserting the generated indicators in the delayed video stream based upon information viewed in the video stream.

Instead, the cited sections of the Flavin patent merely discloses segment announcement receivers that cause a function to occur, such as stop recording or sound muting (see col. 4, lines 3-22). There is no disclosure of splitting the initial video stream into one segment for the operator to view and another segment to be delayed so that the operator may insert indicators into the delayed video stream as recited using the specific steps in amended independent claim 17.

The cited portions of the Flavin patent fail to disclose these above-listed features recited in amended independent claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose each and every feature of amended independent claim 17. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended independent claim 17 is allowable over the cited reference and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Dependent claims 18-20 depend upon amended independent claim 17. These dependent claims thereby include all the limitations of amended independent claim 17, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicant amended independent claim 17 to include limitations not disclosed by the Flavin patent. Accordingly, with the dependency of claims 18-20 upon amended independent claim 17, the Flavin patent also fails to disclose all of the features recited in dependent claims 18-20. Applicant respectfully submits that the Flavin patent thereby fails to anticipate claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and that these claims

are likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claims 18-20 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Similarly, Applicant amended claim 21 to recite a system with components not disclosed by the cited reference. For example, claim 21 also includes an encoder that receives the delayed video signal and the generated indicators and inserts the indicators in the delayed video signal based on the information viewed in the video stream. With respect, Applicant submits that these features are not disclosed by the cited reference.

As outlined above, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 21 is allowable over the cited reference and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Dependent claim 22 is dependent upon amended independent claim 21. This dependent claim thereby includes all the limitations of amended independent claim 21, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicant amended independent claim 21 to include limitations not disclosed by the Flavin patent. Accordingly, with the dependency of claim 22 upon amended independent claim 21, the Flavin patent also fails to disclose all of the features recited in dependent claim 22. Applicant respectfully submits that the Flavin patent thereby fails to anticipate claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and that this claim is likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claim 22 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

3. The Rejection of Claims 23 and 24 as Anticipated by the Kwoh Patent

Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kwoh U.S. Patent Number 6,226,793 ("the Kwoh patent"). In view of the amendments above and the comments below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Applicant amended method claim 23 to recite a method of automatically inserting indicators in a video stream that splits the video stream into portions, delays

one portion of the split video stream to generate a delayed video stream, and assigns retrieved tags and markers to match content identification signals. The delayed video stream and the matched tags and markers are applied to an encoder, and the encoder encodes the delayed video stream with the matched assigned tags and markers.

The Kwoh patent appears to discuss an apparatus and method to allow rating level control of program viewing where parental controls are employed to block programs from viewing (see col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 2). The Kwoh patent employs parental control circuitry connected to a signal source input line to intercept the signal source (see the Kwoh patent, col. 3, line 55 to col. 4, line 7). The Kwoh patent includes a programmable multiple channel filter to form the parental control output (see col. 4, lines 26-30). The filter is controlled to selectively block programs based upon rating information unique to the individual programs.

There is no disclosure in the Kwoh patent of a delay device that operates on the video stream and delays a portion of a split video stream as recited in amended independent claim 23 of the present application. While the Examiner cites col. 13, lines 33-39, Figure 20, Figure 23, and Figure 24 as disclosing this feature, the video tape recorder discussed in this section and figures of the Kwoh patent that the Examiner refers to is merely the source of programming material eventually transmitted by the network head end. There is no delay device that operates on the video stream to generate a delayed video signal or a manner of splitting the video stream into portions and delaying one portion of the split video stream to generate a delayed video stream. The video tape recorder in the Kwoh patent simply provides the recorded material to be transmit. The video tape recorder may play a video tape of a movie or other programming choice as discussed in the cited portion of the Kwoh patent, but there is no disclosure of generation of a delayed video stream as required by claim 23.

Since there is no delayed video signal disclosed in the Kwoh patent, there is likewise no encoder that receives the delayed video stream and the matched assigned tags and markers and encodes the delayed video stream with the matched assigned

tags and markers. Instead, the Kwoh patent appears to discuss how to selectively filter programming based upon the ratings of the individual programs.

The cited portions of the Kwoh patent fail to disclose the above-listed steps recited in amended independent claim 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose each and every feature of amended independent claim 23. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended independent claim 23 is allowable over the cited reference and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Similarly, amended claim 24 recites a system for automatically inserting indicators in a video stream that is used to carry out the method of amended independent claim 23. Applicant likewise amended claim 24 to recited features not disclosed by the Kwoh patent. For example, amended claim 24 recites a delay device to operate on the split video stream to generate a delayed video signal for one portion of the split video. Claim 24 further recites a time synchronizer that receives the delayed video stream and the content identification signal matched with the content identification tags. The resynchronized delayed video stream and the content identification signal matched with the content identification tags and markers are then encoded.

As outlined above with regard to amended claim 23, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 24 also recites features and limitations not disclosed by the cited reference. As such, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 24 is also allowable over the cited reference and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

4. The Rejection of Claims 25, 26, 31, and 32 as Anticipated by Ford

Claims 25, 26, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ford U.S. Patent Number 6,519,770 ("the Ford patent"). As indicated above, Applicants canceled claims 25, 26, 31, and 32 thereby making the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) moot.

10316105.1

5. The Rejection of Claims 33-38 and 40 as Anticipated by Zigmond

Claims 33-38 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zigmond et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,698,020 ("the Zigmond patent"). In view of the amendments above and the comments below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Applicant amended method claim 33 to recite a method of generating an enhanced video signal in response to an indicator encoded in a video stream to include the steps of dividing the video stream to extract a video signal and an extracted indicator from the video stream and using an extracted indicator to generate an access signal, then applying the access signal to access an Internet web site. With respect, Applicant submits that the Zigmond patent fails to disclose or suggest these steps as well as the system components required to carry out these steps.

For example, amended independent claim 33 recites a method of generating an enhanced video signal in response to an indicator encoded in a video stream including extracting the indicator from the video stream to produce an extracted video signal and an extracted indicator. The method of claim 33 then decodes the extracted indicator to generate an access signal, uses the access signal to access an Internet web site and produce a web site signal, and decode the web site signal to generate a supplemental video signal. The method then combines the supplemental video signal and the extracted video signal to generate the enhanced video signal.

The Zigmond patent, on the other hand, inserts advertisements into video programming feeds at the household level (see col. 4, lines 8-11). The Zigmond patent broadcasts advertisements included in the video programming feed. The feed is transmitted to households where a viewer watches the feed (see col. 7, lines 13-17). At a point during the viewing, the display of the video programming feed is interrupted and an advertisement is then displayed to the viewer (see col. 7, lines 26-36). The Zigmond patent, however, fails to disclose an encoded video stream where an indicator is extracted from the video stream to produce an extracted video signal and an extracted indicator. Instead, the Zigmond patent appears to describe a video switch that toggles between video programming feed and selected advertisements (see

col. 8, lines 29-37). Likewise, there is no disclosure in the Zigmond patent of decoding the extracted indicator to generate an access signal as recited in independent claim 33 of the present application. The access signal of the present invention is then used to access an Internet site and produce a web site signal. The Zigmond patent appears to decode cross-over link information and immediately display the links on the display device (see col. 18, line 65 to col. 19, line 2). The extra measure of control in generating an access signal with which to produce a web site signal allows different entities to post and access information as well as provides a measure of additional security in ensuring that a web site is accessed by a user with the requisite permission. These features are not disclosed nor suggested in the Zigmond patent.

The cited portions of the Zigmond patent fail to disclose or suggest these above-listed features recited in amended independent claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 33. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended independent claim 33 is allowable over the cited reference and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Dependent claims 34-36 depend upon amended independent claim 33. These dependent claims thereby include all the limitations of amended independent claim 33, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicant amended independent claim 33 to include limitations not disclosed by the Zigmond patent. Accordingly, with the dependency of claims 34-36 upon amended independent claim 33, the Zigmond patent also fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in dependent claims 34-36. Applicant respectfully submits that the Zigmond patent thereby fails to anticipate claims 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and that these claims are likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claims 34-36 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Applicant amended independent claim 37 to include features substantially similar to those recited above with regard to amended independent claim 33.

10316105.1

Amended independent claim 37 recites a system for generating an enhanced video signal in response to indicators provided in a video stream. The system of claim 37 includes a decoder that is connected to receive the video stream and that separates the indicators from the video stream and produces a video signal, an indicator signal, and an HTML signal. Claim 37 further recites an indicator decoder that receives the indicator signal and decodes the indicator signal to generate a look-up table address. Claim 37 also includes a look-up table address storage device that receives the look-up table address from the decoded indicator signal and generates an Internet address signal, an Internet connection that accesses an Internet address in response to the Internet address signal and provides an Internet information web page. System claim 37 also recites an Internet information web page decoder that decodes Internet information accessed at the Internet address and that generates a supplemental video signal and a combiner that combines the supplemental video signal and the video signal to generate the enhanced video signal.

Applicant amended claim 37 to include the components and limitations discussed above with regard to the decoder that separates indicators from the video stream to produce a video signal, an indicator signal, and an HTML signal. Applicant also amended claim 37 to include an indicator decoder that receives the indicator signal and decodes it to generate a look up table address and generates an Internet address signal.

As such, Applicant submits that amended independent claim 37 recites features and limitations not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference and is therefore allowable over the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Dependent claim 40 depends upon amended independent claim 37. This dependent claim thereby includes all the limitations of amended independent claim 37, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicant amended independent claim 37 to include limitations not disclosed or suggested by the Zigmond patent. Accordingly, with the dependency of claim 40 upon amended independent claim 37, the Zigmond patent also fails to disclose or suggest all of the

features recited in dependent claim 40. Applicant respectfully submits that the Zigmond patent thereby fails to anticipate claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and that this claim is likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claim 40 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

D.   Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

1.   <u>Rejection of Claims 27 and 28 as Unpatentable over Ford in View of Zigmond</u>

Claims 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford in view of Zigmond. As indicated above, Applicants canceled claims 27 and 28 thereby making the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) moot.

2.   <u>Rejection of Claim 29 as Unpatentable over Ford in View of Matthews</u>

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford in view of Matthews, III U.S. Patent Number 5,874,985. As indicated above, Applicants canceled claim 29 thereby making the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) moot.

3.   <u>Rejection of Claim 30 as Unpatentable over Ford in View of Zigmond 2</u>

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford in view of Zigmond et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0268405. As indicated above, Applicants canceled claim 30 thereby making the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) moot.

4.   <u>Rejection of Claim 39 as Unpatentable over Zigmond in View of Isono</u>

Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zigmond in view of Isono et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,690,481 ("the Isono patent").

In view of the amendments above and the comments below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Dependent claim 39 depends upon amended independent claim 37. This dependent claim thereby includes all the limitations of amended independent claim 37, while reciting additional features of the present invention. As noted above, Applicant amended independent claim 37 to include limitations not disclosed or suggested by the Zigmond patent. Further, the Isono patent fails to cure the deficiencies of the Zigmond patent. Namely, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the Isono patent of a decoder that is connected to receive the video stream and that separates the indicators from the video stream and produces a video signal, an indicator signal, and an HTML signal. Further, in the Isono patent, there is no disclosure or suggestion of an indicator decoder that receives the indicator signal and decodes the indicator signal to generate a look-up table address. Likewise, the Isono patent fails to disclose or suggest a look-up table address storage device that receives the look-up table address from the decoded indicator signal and generates an Internet address signal, an Internet connection that accesses an Internet address in response to the Internet address signal and provides an Internet information web page. In the Isono patent, there is no disclosure or suggestion of an Internet information web page decoder that decodes Internet information accessed at the Internet address and that generates a supplemental video signal and a combiner that combines the supplemental video signal and the video signal to generate the enhanced video signal.

Accordingly, with the dependency of claim 39 upon amended independent claim 37, the combination of the Zigmond patent and the Isono patent also fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in dependent claim 39. Applicant respectfully submits that combination of the Zigmond patent and the Isono patent thereby fails to render claim 39 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and that this claim is likewise in proper condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claim 39 and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

E. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of record and allow claims 1-24 and claims 33-40 in the present application to issue. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be beneficial in expediting the prosecution of the present application, Applicant invites the Examiner to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph A. Parisi
Registration No. 53,435

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000